# SEANO: Semi-supervised Embedding in Attributed Networks with Outliers

Jiongqian Liang
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
The Ohio State University
liang.420@osu.edu

Peter Jacobs
Data Analytics
The Ohio State University
jacobs.269@osu.edu

Srinivasan Parthasarathy
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
The Ohio State University
srini@cse.ohio-state.edu

arXiv:1703.08100v1 [cs.SI] 23 Mar 2017

## ABSTRACT

Network embedding has attracted an increasing amount of attention in recent years due to its wide-ranging applications in graph mining tasks such as vertex classification, community detection, and network visualization. While embedding homogeneous networks has been widely studied, few methods have examined the embedding of partially labeled attributed networks (PLAN) that arise in a semi-supervised setting. In this paper, we propose a novel framework, called Semi-supervised Embedding in Attributed Networks with Outliers (`SEANO`), to learn a robust low-dimensional vector representation that captures the topological proximity, attribute affinity and label similarity of vertices in a PLAN while accounting for outliers. We design a tree-shaped deep neural network with both a supervised and an unsupervised component. These components share the first several layers of the network. We alternate training between the two components to iteratively push information regarding network structure, attributes, and labels into the embedding. Experimental results on various datasets demonstrate the advantages of `SEANO` over state-of-the-art methods in semi-supervised classification under both transductive and inductive settings. We also show as a byproduct that `SEANO` can significantly outperform other methods when applied to the task of outlier detection. Finally, we present the use of `SEANO` in a challenging real-world setting - flood mapping of satellite images. Qualitatively, we find that `SEANO` is able to outperform state-of-the-art remote sensing algorithms on this task.

**Keywords:** Semi-supervised Learning, Network Embedding, Outlier Detection

## 1. INTRODUCTION

An increasing number of applications are modeled and analyzed as attributed networks, where vertices represent entities with attributes and edges express the interactions or relationships between entities. For example, the World Wide Web can be naturally formatted as an attribute network with vertices being web pages and edges being hyper-links. Social network sites, such as Twitter and Facebook, are inherently attributed networks where vertices stand for users with various attributes (e.g. demographic features) and edges represent social relations. While attributed networks contain richer information than plain networks, they are also more challenging to analyze. In view of the tremendous success of *network embedding* [34, 27, 13] in plain networks for graph mining tasks such as vertex classification [40], network visualization [34], and outlier detection [14], some researchers have adapted a similar idea and developed attributed network embeddings by capturing both topological proximity and vertex attribute affinity [15]. Attributed network embedding, though still in its early stages, has been shown to be effective in document representation and text mining tasks [17, 37].

In many applications, one also has knowledge about the labels of some vertices in an attributed network. Such networks are referred to as partially labeled attributed networks (PLAN). For example, in a social network such as Facebook or Twitter, there may exist group or community information for some users. In question-answer platforms such as Stack Overflow, we may know the topics that the users are interested in. These labels, though not nescessarily available for all vertices, provide additional and potentially useful information in the task of network embedding. While most existing work does not exploit such labels, here we address the problem of semi-supervised embedding in attributed networks by leveraging the labels in a PLAN. Huang *et al.* incorporate label information into the embedding, but they assume all labels are available, which is rarely the case in practice [15]. The work most similar to ours is Planetoid [38], which proposes a semi-supervised learning method based on graph embeddings. However, their work is specifically aimed at semi-supervised classification. With this objective in mind, the network embedding output by their method does not incorporate all information and cannot generalize to other applications (see Section 4 for a detailed explanation).

In this paper, we propose a novel approach for learning an integrated embedding for each vertex in a PLAN by jointly incorporating graph structure, vertex attribute information, and available labels. Specifically, we design a tree-shaped deep neural network with two output layers. These layers provide label and context predictions respectively, while sharing connections to the first several layers in the network. The two different output layers respectively form the supervised and unsupervised components of our model. By alternately training the two components of the PLAN, we *learn a unified embedding encompassing information related*

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Copyright 20XX ACM X-XXXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...$15.00.

*to structure, attributes, and labels.* Furthermore, we explicitly account for the notion of outliers during model training and propose an effective way to alleviate the potentially adverse impact these vertices can have on the learned embedding. We also show that our method can generate quality embeddings for new vertices unseen during training, therefore supporting inductive learning in nature. We refer to our method as Semi-supervised Embedding in Attributed Networks with Outliers (`SEANO`). We empirically evaluate the quality of the embeddings generated by `SEANO` through semi-supervised classification and show that `SEANO` significantly outperforms state-of-the-art methods in both transductive and inductive settings. We also conduct outlier detection based on the output embeddings of `SEANO` and demonstrate its advantages over baseline methods. A case study of flood mapping visually shows the power of `SEANO` when applied to classification and outlier detection for flood mapping.

We summarize our contributions as follows: 1) We propose a semi-supervised method, `SEANO`, to conduct network embedding in PLANs. The method can jointly capture information about graph structure, vertex attributes, and available labels. 2) We propose an effective strategy to mitigate the negative effect of outliers in embedding learning. 3) `SEANO` can be used to infer embeddings of vertices unobserved at training time, thus supporting both transductive and inductive learning.

# 2. METHODOLOGY

## 2.1 Problem Formulation

We first provide the definition of a Partially Labeled Attributed Network (PLAN) and formulate our framework for semi-supervised embedding on attributed networks with outliers (`SEANO`).

DEFINITION 1. ***Partially Labeled Attributed Network.*** *A partially labeled attributed network is an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, X, Y)$, where: $V = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ is the set of vertices; $E$ is the set of edges; $X = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, ..., \mathbf{x}_n)$ is the attribute information matrix; and $Y = (y_1, y_2, ..., y_n)$ are the labels of the vertices in $V$, most of which are unknown.*

Depending on whether the label of a vertex is known or not, we divide the vertices into labeled vertices $V_L$ and unlabeled vertices $V_U$. In this paper, we consider the potentially negative effect of *network outliers*. Following the definition elsewhere [2], we define *network outliers* in a PLAN as vertices that are rare and that differ significantly from the majority of the reference vertices in the PLAN. An example outlier in a PLAN would be a vertex containing very different attributes from other vertices in the same community. With the concept of the PLAN and the network outlier, we define our embedding learning problem as follows.

DEFINITION 2. ***Semi-supervised Embedding in Attributed Networks with Outliers.*** *Given a partially labeled attributed network $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, X, Y)$ with a small portion of network outliers, we aim to learn a robust low-dimensional vector representation $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$ for each vertex $i$, where $r \ll n$, s.t. $\mathbf{e}_i$ can jointly capture the information of the attributes, graph structure, and the partial labels in the PLAN.*

The notation for this paper is summarized in Table 1. We next describe our framework for semi-supervised network embedding and then propose a simple but effective way to address network outliers.

| Symbol | Definition |
|---|---|
| $\mathcal{G}$ | partially labeled attributed network |
| $V$ | vertex set |
| $E$ | edge set |
| $X$ | attribute information matrix |
| $Y$ | vertex labels |
| $n$ | number of vertices |
| $d$ | number of attributes |
| $r$ | dimensionality of the embedding |
| $V_L$, $V_U$ | labeled vertices, unlabeled vertices |
| $\mathbf{e}_i$ | embedding of a vertex $i$ |
| $\mathbf{W}^k, \mathbf{b}^k$ | weights and biases at the $k$-th layer |
| $\mathbf{h}^k(\cdot)$ | values at the $k$-th layer |
| $\mathbf{W}^{(s)}, \mathbf{W}^{(u)}$ | weights at the (un)supervised output layer |
| $L_s, L_u$ | loss function of (un)supervised learning |
| $f(\cdot)$ | outlier scoring function |
| $\bar{s}_i$ | normalized outlier score of vertex $i$ |

Table 1: Table of notations




Figure 1: Network architecture: the feed-forward artificial neural network model takes the vertex attributes as the input and outputs the class label and graph context respectively. The upper part (in purple) is shared while the left part (in green) is the supervised component and the right part (in blue) is the unsupervised component.

## 2.2 The Proposed Model

### 2.2.1 Framework

We propose `SEANO`, a semi-supervised deep neural network model used to conduct network embedding. The `SEANO` network architecture is illustrated in Figure 1. The architecture consists of a deep model with a series of non-linear mapping functions. These mapping functions transform the feature space into a non-linear latent space. After training, the non-linear latent space collectively incorporates information about network structure, vertex attributes, and the provided partial labels. As shown in Figure 1, there are two output layers. Both output layers are influenced by the first $l_1$ layers, which range from the input layer to the embedding layer. The left output layer in Figure 1 predicts the class of the network input and is considered as the supervised learning component of the model. The right output layer gives the graph context of the network input and is regarded as the unsupervised component of the model. The supervised part of the network utilizes the label information

while the unsupervised part of the network incorporates the graph structure information. These two parts are tightly inter-connected as they share the first $l_1$ layers. Moreover, attribute information is naturally integrated into the embedding since it is the input to the deep model. We next formally define the loss functions we adopt for both the supervised and unsupervised learning parts of the model, and subsequently discuss the details of model training.

### 2.2.2 Loss Functions

The $k$-th layer of the deep model is defined as

$$\mathbf{h}^k(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sigma\left(\mathbf{W}^k\mathbf{h}^{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \mathbf{b}^k\right) \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{W}^k$ and $\mathbf{b}^k$ are the weights and biases in the $k$-th layer, $\sigma(\cdot)$ is a non-linear activation function, and $\mathbf{h}^0(\mathbf{x}_i) = \mathbf{x}_i$ is the input layer. We set the activation function to be the rectified linear unit, i.e. $\sigma(x) = \max(0, x)$.

Following this definition, the input values of the softmax layer for label prediction can be formulated as $\mathbf{h}^{l_2}(\mathbf{h}^{l_1}(\mathbf{x}_i)) = \mathbf{h}^{l_1+l_2}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Similarly, the input of the softmax layer for graph context prediction is $\mathbf{h}^{l_1+l_3}(\mathbf{x}_i)$.

The supervised learning component of the deep model shown in the left part of Figure 1 is the canonical multi-layer perceptron (MLP). The loss function for the supervised learning component of the model is:

$$L_s = -\sum_{i \in V_L} \log p(y_i|\mathbf{x}_i) \tag{2}$$

where $p(y_i|\mathbf{x}_i)$ is the likelihood for the target label using the softmax function and is formally defined as

$$p(y_i|\mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{\exp\left(\mathbf{h}^{l_1+l_2}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T\mathbf{W}^{(s)}_{y_i}\right)}{\sum_{y_j \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp\left(\mathbf{h}^{l_1+l_2}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T\mathbf{W}^{(s)}_{y_j}\right)} \tag{3}$$

Here, $\mathcal{Y}$ denotes the set of possible labels. As written in Figure 1, $\mathbf{W}^{(s)}$ is the weight matrix of the softmax layer used in the supervised learning part of the model.

The unsupervised learning component of `SEANO` is analogous to methods used in Word2Vec [22] and DeepWalk [27]. We adopt the Skip-gram model [22] to capture the relationship between the target vertex (at input) and context vertex (at output). For each node $i$ in a PLAN with attributes $\mathbf{x}_i$, we generate its context $C_i = \{v_{i,1}, v_{i,2}, ..., v_{i,c}\}$. We then construct the loss function as:

$$\begin{aligned} L_u &= -\sum_{i \in V} \log p(\{v_{i,1}, v_{i,2}, ..., v_{i,c}\}|\mathbf{x}_i) \\ &= -\sum_{i \in V} \sum_{v' \in C_i} \log p(v'|\mathbf{x}_i) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $p(v'|\mathbf{x}_i)$ is the likelihood of the target context given the vertex attributes and is formally defined as

$$p(v'|\mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{\exp\left(\mathbf{h}^{l_1+l_3}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T\mathbf{W}^{(u)}_{v'}\right)}{\sum_{v \in V} \exp\left(\mathbf{h}^{l_1+l_3}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T\mathbf{W}^{(u)}_{v}\right)} \tag{5}$$

$\mathbf{W}^{(u)}$ is the weight matrix of the softmax layer used in the unsupervised part of the model. Note that this formulation is different from the one in DeepWalk [27] because the prediction likelihood $p(v'|\mathbf{x}_i)$ is conditioned on the attributes instead of the vertex itself. In order words, the input layer is of dimension $d$ instead of $n$. We detail the advantage of this particular formulation shortly.

We now discuss how the context $C_i$ is generated for each vertex $i$ in the network. We categorize the context of a vertex into the *network context* and the *label context* adapting and extending ideas presented in [38]. The network context of a vertex consists of the vertices that are close to the vertex in the network. This context is designed to capture topological structure information. As discussed in a previous work [27], the network context of a vertex can be generated through truncated random walks in the network. The label context of a vertex $i$ is defined as the vertices sharing the same label as $i$. The label context can be generated by uniformly sampling from vertices with label $y_i$. Note that while all vertices have network context[1], only labeled vertices contain label context.

For each vertex $i$, we generate in total $c$ context vertices following the steps illustrated in Algorithm 1. Specifically, for a labeled vertex, we sample $c * \alpha$ label context vertices (Line 2-3) and $c * (1 - \alpha)$ network context vertices from the stream of short random walks (Line 4). For an unlabeled vertex, we extract $c$ network context vertices (Line 6). For generating network context we essentially follow the same approach as Deepwalk [27].

**Algorithm 1** Vertex Context Sampling

**Input**: The given PLAN $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, X, Y)$, target vertex $i$, size of context $c$, and ratio of label context $\alpha$.
**Output**: Vertex context $C_i$.

1: **if** $i \in V_L$ **then** ▷ node $i$ is labeled.
2: | $S_{y_i} = \{j : j \in V_L \wedge y_j = y_i\}$. ▷ nodes with label $y_i$.
3: | $C_i \leftarrow$randomly sample $c * \alpha$ label context from $S_{y_i}$.
4: | $C_i \leftarrow C_i \cup$ {sample $c * (1 - \alpha)$ network context vertices}.
5: **else**
6: | $C_i \leftarrow$ sample $c$ network context vertices.
7: Return $C_i$.

### 2.2.3 Model Training

In this part, we discuss how we jointly minimize the supervised loss $L_s$ and the unsupervised loss $L_u$. We start by describing the optimization procedures for each respective part (supervised and unsupervised) of our model. As mentioned previously, the supervised unit in the left part of Figure 1 is the standard MLP. We can easily use back-propagation and gradient descent to train the model [30].

For the unsupervised component with the loss function described in Eq. 4, training can be rather expensive because the cost of computing $\nabla(\log p(v'|\mathbf{x}_i))$ using Eq. 5 is proportional to the number of vertices in $V$, which can be very large. To address this problem, we adopt the negative sampling strategy [22]. Instead of looking at all the vertices when computing the denominator of $p(v'|\mathbf{x}_i)$ in Eq. 5, we only consider the target vertex $v'$ and a few negative samples denoted by the set $V_{neg}$. Therefore, we can approximate $p(v'|\mathbf{x}_i)$ using:

$$p(v'|\mathbf{x}_i) \approx \frac{\exp\left(\mathbf{h}^{l_1+l_3}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T\mathbf{W}^{(u)}_{v'}\right)}{\sum_{v \in V_{neg} \cup \{v'\}} \exp\left(\mathbf{h}^{l_1+l_3}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T\mathbf{W}^{(u)}_{v}\right)} \tag{6}$$

Here, we uniformly sample $t$ negative samples at random

[1]We assume no isolated node exists in the network

from $V$. We set $t = 6$ as recommended by [22], which we empirically found to work well in our context as well.

To jointly minimize the supervised loss and unsupervised loss in our model, we use Mini-Batch Stochastic Gradient Descent and alternate updating the parameters between the two components of the model. The detailed algorithm for training is shown in Algorithm 2. As illustrated in Algorithm 2, we jointly train the two components by alternating between them with a batch size of $B_1$ on the supervised part and $B_2$ on the unsupervised part. Lines 4-5 update model parameters for the supervised component of the model while lines 7-16 update parameters for the unsupervised component. Note that these two components are tightly connected as they share the first $l_1$ layers in the neural network (see Figure 1). As a result, both the supervised component and unsupervised component will update the parameters in the shared layers. The final embedding for each node is composed of the activation values in the $l_1$-th hidden layer (i.e. the last shared layer), represented as $\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{h}^{l_1}(\mathbf{x}_i)$.

The generated embedding collectively incorporates label, attribute, and topological structure information. The supervised learning component feeds attribute and label information into the embedding layer while the unsupervised learning component forces the embedding to capture structural information. By alternately training the two parts, we can generate an integrated embedding for vertices in the PLAN.

**Algorithm 2** Model Training

**Input**: The given partially labeled attributed network $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, X, Y)$, $B_1$, $B_2$, and $t$.
**Output**: Embedding $\mathcal{E} = (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, ..., \mathbf{e}_n)$ of the PLAN.

1: Initialize the weights and biases in the neural network using Glorot initialization [12].
2: **while** not converged **and** not reaching max iterations **do**
3: | *// Training on the supervised component.*
4: | Sample $B_1$ labeled instances from $V_L$.
5: | Compute $\nabla L_s$ and update the weights and biases.
6: | *// Training on the unsupervised component.*
7: | $C = \emptyset$, $V_{neg} = \emptyset$.
8: | Sample $B_2$ instances from $V$, denoted as $V_B$.
9: | **for** each node $i \in V_B$ **do**
10: | | $C_i \leftarrow$ sample vertex context using Algorithm 1.
11: | | $C \leftarrow C \cup C_i$.
12: | | **for** each node $v' \in C_i$ **do** ▷ negative sampling
13: | | | $V_{v',neg} \leftarrow$ randomly sample $t$ vertices from $V$.
14: | | | $V_{neg} \leftarrow V_{neg} \cup V_{v',neg}$.
15: | Compute $\nabla L_u$ using $C$ and $V_{neg}$ based on Eq. 4 and 6.
16: | Update weights and biases based on the gradient $\nabla L_u$.
17: **for** each vertex $i \in V$ **do**
18: | Compute the embedding $\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{h}^{l_1}(\mathbf{x}_i)$.
19: Return $\mathcal{E} = (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, ..., \mathbf{e}_n)$.

## 2.3 Redressing Outliers in Training

The existence of outliers in a dataset can often seriously undermine the performance of many machine learning tasks [8]. In this paper, we incorporate the notion of outliers into the embedding learning model and show how to effectively pinpoint the outliers and leverage this knowledge to alleviate the negative effect they can potentially have on the learned embedding.

It is non-trivial to detect outliers in a PLAN due to the heterogeneous nature of the data, where each vertex carries with it topological, attributed, and potentially labeled information. However, if we can embed all the information into a latent space and learn a proper low-dimensional vector representation for each vertex, we can easily utilize any off-the-shelf outlier detection algorithm. However, the learning of the embeddings again can be adversely affected by the existence of outliers! Considering the interplay between outlier detection and embedding learning, we propose an iterative method to simultaneously conduct the two tasks. Specifically, we use the intermediate embeddings during the training process to detect the outliers, and try to downplay the role of the outliers from the training dataset before the next round of training. Next, we describe how we detect the outliers using the embeddings and how the impact of such outliers are alleviated.

Given an embedding of the network $\mathcal{E} = (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, ..., \mathbf{e}_n)$, we define the outlier score of each vertex $i$ as $s_i = f(\mathbf{e}_i)$, where $f(\cdot)$ is an outlier scoring function and can be derived from any applicable outlier detection approach[2]. We then pick a threshold $\theta$ such that vertices with outlier scores larger than $\theta$ are likely to be outliers. We define the set of outlier candidates as $O = \{v : v \in V \wedge f(\mathbf{e}_v) > \theta\}$.

During the training process, if we infer the outlier candidates $O$ based on the current embeddings, we want to alleviate the possibly negative effect they can have on the follow-up round of training. To this end, we adopt the following removal strategy on $O$. Specifically, we normalize the outlier scores of vertices in $O$ to the range $[0, 1]$ so that each vertex $i \in O$ is associated with a normalized score $\bar{s}_i$. For each vertex $i \in O$, we then temporarily remove it from the training dataset with probability $\bar{s}_i$.

We introduce this strategy to our model training and show the steps of the embedding learning in Algorithm 3. In the algorithm, $V_O$ denotes the set of vertices to be eliminated from the training dataset. It is initially set as $\emptyset$ and updated each epoch during training. Lines 18-22 show how $V_O$ is updated based on the current embeddings. With set $V_O$ in hand, the algorithm avoids vertices in $V_O$ when fetching batches of data for training (See Line 5, 9, and 12).

Note that the choice of $\theta$ might be non-trivial depending on the outlier detection method and the underlying data distribution. Because of this, it is preferable to choose outlier detection methods which output normalized and interpretable scores. In this paper, we use the Isolation Forest algorithm [20] to compute outlier scores because it outputs normalized scores in the range $(0, 1]$. As discussed in [20], instances with a score larger than 0.5 are considered likely to be outliers and therefore, we set $\theta = 0.5$.

## 2.4 Generalization to Inductive Learning

`SEANO` is designed for *transductive* embedding learning. This means the algorithm only learns the embeddings for vertices observed at training time. However, in practice some vertices might not be accessible during the training phase or there may be new vertices added to the network. This requires an *inductive* embedding learning method, where we can infer the embeddings of vertices unobserved at training time. We point out that `SEANO` can be easily generalized to *inductive* embedding learning with almost no changes. This generalization is possible because the input layer of the neural network involves only the attributes of the vertices. Suppose we have trained our model and there is a new vertex $v^*$ with attributes $\mathbf{x}^*$; its embedding can be inferred as $\mathbf{e}^* = \mathbf{h}^{l_1}(\mathbf{x}^*)$. Note that with this formulation we do not explicitly consider the graph structure of the new vertex. We

[2]The higher the outlier score, the more likely a vertex is to be an outlier.

**Algorithm 3** Model Training with Outlier Handling

**Input**: The given partially labeled attributed network $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, X, Y)$, $B_1$, $B_2$, $t$, $f(\cdot)$, and $\theta$.
**Output**: Embedding $\mathcal{E} = (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, ..., \mathbf{e}_n)$ of each vertex $i$.

Initialize the weights and biases in the neural network using Glorot initialization [12].
$V_O = \emptyset$.
**while** not converged **and** not reaching max iterations **do**
  *// Training on the supervised component.*
  Sample $B_1$ labeled instances from $V_L \setminus V_O$.
  Compute $\nabla L_s$ and update the weights and biases.
  *// Training on the unsupervised component.*
  $C = \emptyset$, $V_{neg} = \emptyset$.
  Sample $B_2$ instances from $V \setminus V_O$, denoted as $V_B$.
  **for** each node $i \in V_B$ **do**
    $C_i \leftarrow$ sample vertex context using Algorithm 1.
    $C \leftarrow C \cup C_i \setminus V_O$.
    **for** each node $v' \in C_i$ **do** ▷ negative sampling
      $V_{v',neg} \leftarrow$ randomly sample $t$ vertices from $V$.
      $V_{neg} \leftarrow V_{neg} \cup V_{v',neg}$.
  Compute $\nabla L_u$ using $C$ and $V_{neg}$ based on Eq. 4 and 6.
  Update weights and biases based on the gradient $\nabla L_u$.
  **if** it is the end of one epoch **then**
    Update the embedding $\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{h}^{l_1}(\mathbf{x}_i), \forall i \in V$.
    Compute the outlier score for each vertex $s_i = f(\mathbf{e}_i)$.
    Outlier candidates $O = \{v : v \in V \wedge s_v > \theta\}$.
    Normalize the outlier score to be $\bar{s}_i$ for vertex $i \in O$.
    $V_O \leftarrow$ sample $i \in O$ with probability $\bar{s}_i$.
**for** each vertex $i \in V$ **do**
  Compute the embedding $\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{h}^{l_1}(\mathbf{x}_i)$.
Return $\mathcal{E} = (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, ..., \mathbf{e}_n)$.

| Dataset | # Classes | # Attributes | # Vertices | # Edges |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cora | 7 | 1433 | 2,708 | 5,429 |
| Citeseer | 6 | 3703 | 3,327 | 4,732 |
| Pubmed | 3 | 500 | 19,717 | 44,338 |
| Houston | 2 | 3 | 39,215 | 155,638 |

Table 2: Dataset Information

assume the new vertex comes from the same data distribution as the training dataset and that the trained model has implicitly incorporated the dependent relationship between attributes and structural information. In the case where the new vertex contains some novel pattern (concept) that is not captured in the existing training dataset, our model may fail to capture this information leading to a loss in performance. Improving this generalization to handle such concept drift is something we plan to look at in the future.

# 3. EXPERIMENTS AND ANALYSES

## 3.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets:** The datasets we use in our experiments are described in Table 2. Three of these are text datasets: Cora, Citeseer, and Pubmed[3] [31], that were used in prior work [38]. In these datasets, vertices represent published papers while edges (undirected) denote the citations among them. Each paper contains a list of keywords and they are treated as attributes. The publications in each dataset are classified into multiple categories depending on their respective topics. We also use a satellite image dataset of Houston, Texas, which is collected through synthetic aperture radar (SAR). We convert the image into an undirected graph following the approach proposed by Cour *et al.* [9]. Each pixel of the image is treated as one vertex and has edges to nearby pixels within a Euclidean distance of 1.5 units. Each vertex (pixel) contains a geographic elevation feature and two different kinds of signals from SAR, which we use as attributes for the vertices. Our goal is to classify each pixel as either water or land; this process is known as Water Extent Delineation, a critical step in post-disaster flood mapping. We utilize water extent ground truth provided by a domain expert for this dataset.

**Baseline Methods:** We compare the performance of `SEANO` to the following baseline methods for semi-supervised classification:

- Planetoid-T [38]: A recently proposed state-of-the-art transductive version of Planetoid, which uses a deep neural network to perform semi-supervised learning with graph embeddings.
- SVM [33]: This is a standard Support Vector Machine algorithm that considers attribute information and does not use the structure of the graph.
- TSVM [16]: The Transductive Support Vector Machine is a variant of the regular SVM that uses both labeled data and unlabeled data for training. Again, this method does not use graph structure information.
- Node2Vec+ [13]: Node2Vec is an improved version of DeepWalk [27]. It uses truncated random walks and the Skip-Gram model to learn the embedding of a graph. We use Node2Vec to extract the structural features and concatenate them with the original vertex attributes. We learn an SVM classifier on the concatenated features and denote this method as Node2Vec+.

**Setup:** For each dataset in the experiment, we randomly select a small number of instances from each class[4] and treat them as the labeled data for training. We randomly sample 10% of the remaining data as the validation dataset for the purpose of parameter tuning. The rest of data is treated as the testing dataset. For `SEANO`, Planetoid-T, TSVM and Node2Vec+, we train the model under the transductive learning setting where we assume the testing dataset, though unlabeled, can be observed and used during the training phase. For the standard SVM, we only use the labeled data for training. For all the methods, evaluation is conducted on the testing dataset. In the evaluation phase of `SEANO`, after the model has been trained, we only use the supervised learning component for predicting the labels of vertices. We compare the performance of different methods using several metrics. For the first three datasets (Cora, Citeseer, and Pubmed), each of which contains multiple labels, we use micro-$F_1$ (which is equal to accuracy in the multi-label case), macro-$F_1$, and weighted macro-$F_1$ scores. For the Houston dataset, we use accuracy, precision, and the $F_1$ score.

We implement `SEANO` using the Theano package[5] in `Python`. For Planetoid and Node2Vec+, we employ the source code from the authors. Finally, we use the SVM-light package for SVM and TSVM[6]. The dimensionality of the embedding $r$ is set to 50 for all the methods wherever applicable. For `SEANO`, we set the size of the context $c$ as 8, and set $l_1 = l_2 = l_3 = 1$. We use the validation dataset to tune $B_1$, $B_2$, and $\alpha$ for the best performance. For Planetoid-T and Node2Vec+, we use the parameters recommended in the original paper. All experiments were conducted on a machine running Linux with

[3]http://linqs.cs.umd.edu/projects/projects/lbc

[4]This number is 50 for the Houston dataset and 20 for the others.

[5]http://deeplearning.net/software/theano/

[6]http://svmlight.joachims.org/

an Intel Xeon E5-2680 CPU (28 cores, 2.40GHz) and 128GB of RAM.

## 3.2 Semi-Supervised Learning Results

The performance of all the compared methods on the four datasets is reported in Figure 2. Each bar chart in Figure 2 corresponds to one dataset while bars with different colors and patterns represent distinct methods[7]. We highlight the following main observations:

**1)** In general, SEANO and Planetoid-T outperform other methods including the SVM and the TSVM, which do not consider the network structure. This observation is more obvious on the Cora dataset, where SEANO and Planetoid-T perform nearly 10% better than the SVM and the TSVM. This implies that topological information and the graph embeddings help improve semi-supervised classification.

**2)** Simply concatenating network embeddings with attributes does not always improve the performance of semi-supervised classification. This can be observed by comparing the performance of Node2Vec+ with the SVM. Note that Node2Vec+ is different from the SVM in that it extends the original vertex attributes by concatenating the vertex embedding. Node2Vec+ outperforms the SVM on Cora and Citeseer while it is worse on the other two datasets. As shown in Figure 2d, for the Houston dataset, simple concatenation of features seriously undermines performance. The relatively poor performance of Node2Vec+ compared to SEANO indicates that network structure is helpful in semi-supervised learning only when it is incorporated in a systematic manner. This validates the necessity for proposing a principled way to unitedly learn the embeddings of a PLAN.

**3)** SEANO consistently outperforms other methods. In particular, it always outperforms the state-of-the-art method Planetoid-T. This can be explained by the fact that Planetoid-T does not learn a united embedding for each vertex and that the unlabeled data is not fully utilized (its unsupervised learning component is not dependent on the attributes). Additionally, SEANO's strategy for redressing outliers in embedding learning helps improve the quality of embeddings, leading to a better performance in semi-supervised classification.

## 3.3 Outlier Detection with SEANO

In the second experiment, we drill down on how SEANO can simultaneously learn better network embeddings and detect outliers more accurately. We manually inject (plant) outliers into the aforementioned datasets. We randomly select 5% of the vertices in the training dataset, including both labeled and unlabeled data, and add noise to the attributes following the natural perturbation scheme described by Song *et al.* [32][8]. In addition, we rewire the graph structure of the selected vertices in a manner akin to a network configuration model, by connecting them to randomly sampled vertices (while degree remains fixed). We run SEANO as well as the other baselines mentioned above, on the resulting noisy datasets in a semi-supervised setting as described above. Additionally, we conduct outlier detection at the end of embedding learning and compare the detected outliers with the ground truth. For SEANO, we run the Isolation Forest algorithm [20] on the final embeddings, similar to the steps mentioned in Section 2.3. As a baseline, we directly apply the Isolation Forest algorithm to the vertex attributes (denoted as Attri.-only) and also to the concatenated attributes generated by Node2Vec+[9]. We add a simplified version of SEANO as another baseline without considering the outliers in the training dataset, denoted as SEANO-simple. Since the embedding layer in Planetoid-T only captures topological and label information (but not attribute information), we concatenate its embedding with attributes for outlier detection and denote it as Planetoid-T+. To evaluate the performance of outlier detection, we set the number of outliers to detect as the number of injected outliers, which is 5% of the whole dataset. We then compute the Jaccard Index between the set of detected outliers and the set of injected outliers (i.e. ground truth). We also measure the precision of outlier detection, which is the proportion of correctly detected outliers amongst reported outliers.

The performance of semi-supervised classification on these noisy datasets is shown in Figure 3. We observe similar results to those of Figure 2. In general, SEANO consistently performs better than other methods when evaluated on noise injected datasets. The performance of outlier detection is presented in Table 3. We observe that outlier detection based on the embeddings learned by SEANO significantly outperform other methods. This indicates that the proposed methods are able to learn the embeddings of the PLAN effectively, capturing more information from the original dataset, while eliminating noise. Furthermore, SEANO detects the planted outliers more accurately than the variant of SEANO that does not redress outliers during training. In fact, SEANO detects almost all the outliers in the Pubmed and Houston datasets (with precisions of 0.989 and 0.998 respectively). This observation reveals that by iteratively removing some outlier candidates from the training dataset, SEANO is able to learn more robust and informative embeddings.

## 3.4 Case Study: Flood Mapping

We examine the performance of SEANO on a challenging real world problem (Flood Mapping). For this purpose we rely on a higher-resolution satellite image of Houston collected immediately following the 2016 Houston flood using synthetic aperture radar that has been manually annotated by a domain expert (ground truth). There are two raw attributes (HH and HV) from radar and another representing geographic elevation for each pixel in the image. HH and HV measure the polarity of waves reflected by a material and are helpful in distinguishing water from land. The goal is to conduct semi-supervised learning to discriminate water from land. To this end, we convert the satellite image into a PLAN following the same method in Section 3 (this PLAN is denoted as Houston-large). In total, the PLAN for this dataset contains $3,926,150$ vertices and $15,692,353$ edges. Again as described in Section 3, we run different methods on Houston-large and show the results in Table 4. Here we also include baselines that are specialized in flood mapping and image segmentation from the remote-sensing and computer vision community. HUG-FM is a state-of-the-art algorithm for semi-supervised water delineation on satellite images [18]. NORM-THRE [21] is a modern split-based automatic thresholding method for water delineation

[7]TSVM is not shown for the Houston dataset as it did not complete training within 48 hours

[8]We select $\min(0.02 * d, 2)$ attributes as indicator attributes to receive injected noise.

[9]We also tried to compare with FocusCO [28] but found that for this problem it performs poorly (high false-positive rate) and thus do not report it here.




(a) Cora (b) Citeseer (c) Pubmed (d) Houston

Figure 2: Classification performance comparisons of different methods for the four datasets. The $y$-axis denotes the value of each measurement while the $x$-axis groups different methods by measurements.




(a) Noisy Cora (b) Noisy Citeseer (c) Noisy Pubmed (d) Noisy Houston

Figure 3: Classification performance comparisons of different methods for the four datasets **with outliers injected**.




(a) Cora (b) Citeseer (c) Pubmed (d) Houston

Figure 4: **Inductive classification** performance comparison of different methods on the four datasets.

developed in the remote sensing community. OTSU [25] is a venerable clustering-based thresholding method widely used in computer vision and remote sensing. The results in Table 4 clearly show that SEANO comprehensively outperforms these methods.

We also visualize the original data as well as the results of SEANO in Figure 5. Comparing the water delineation result in Figure 5b with the original satellite image in Figure 5a, we can observe that SEANO accurately delineates water areas of different shapes (e.g. long thin rivers). In addition, the white circles in Figure 5c highlight the 80 outliers with the highest outlier scores output by SEANO. Visually, most of the outliers are very bright and dazzling compared to surrounding pixels. To find out what those outliers are in reality, we cross-reference them with Google Maps. Figure 5d shows the areas associated with 4 representative outliers in Google Maps, where each row corresponds to one particular type of characteristic outlier. The first row in Figure 5d shows shipping containers and ships in water bodies (corresponding to $A$ and $B$ in Figure 5c) while the second row presents areas with large white cylindrical tanks (often housing treated water) that are common in factories (corresponding to $C$ and $D$ in Figure 5c). We look into the 80 outliers and find that a majority of them fall into these two cases. These outliers are common in that they contain strongly reflective metal surfaces, causing them to have higher HH and HV values than neighboring pixels. This case study demonstrates that SEANO is capable of learning reliable embeddings that can facilitate classification on PLANs. It also shows that SEANO is an effective tool for remote sensing and in particular flood mapping.

## 3.5 Inductive Learning with SEANO

As we discussed in Section 2.4, SEANO can be generalized to inductive learning. In this final experiment, we show that SEANO can be used to infer the embeddings of vertices that are unobserved during model training. Specifically, we conduct classification under the inductive setting, in which the testing dataset is held-out and unobserved during the training phase. We randomly sample a number of unlabeled vertices as the unobserved testing dataset (1,000 for Cora, Citeseer, and Pubmed; 10,000 for Houston). The rest of the unlabeled instances are still utilized for training. But these instances are no longer used for evaluation purposes. The rest of the experimental settings are similar to those in Section 3. However, we remove the TSVM because it is not applicable in the inductive setting. We also use the induc-

| | Cora | | Citeseer | | Pubmed | | Houston | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Methods** | Jacc. Idx | Prec. | Jacc. Idx | Prec. | Jacc. Idx | Prec. | Jacc. Idx | Prec. |
| SEANO | **0.744** | **0.853** | **0.797** | **0.887** | **0.979** | **0.989** | **0.996** | **0.998** |
| SEANO-simple | 0.689 | 0.816 | 0.785 | 0.880 | 0.757 | 0.862 | 0.995 | 0.997 |
| Planetoid-T+ | 0.162 | 0.279 | 0.189 | 0.317 | 0.072 | 0.135 | 0.134 | 0.236 |
| Attr.-only | 0.124 | 0.221 | 0.219 | 0.359 | 0.073 | 0.137 | 0.972 | 0.986 |
| Node2Vec+ | 0.153 | 0.265 | 0.184 | 0.311 | 0.062 | 0.117 | 0.136 | 0.239 |

Table 3: Outlier detection performance comparison. Jaccard index (Jacc. Idx) and precision (Prec.) are reported.




(a) Original data (b) Water delineation (c) Top-80 outliers detected (d) Example outliers

Figure 5: Visualization of results. (a) Visualization of the original SAR data of the Houston area. (b) Water delineation results from using SEANO for semi-supervised classification. (c) Top-80 pixels with the highest outlier scores based on the embedding generated by SEANO. (d) Google Maps screen shots of the area surrounding 4 representative outliers. The two rows summarize common patterns of outliers. From upper left to lower right, they correspond to $A$, $B$, $C$ and $D$ in (c).

| | Accuracy | $F_1$ Score |
|---|---|---|
| SEANO | **0.9685** | **0.8982** |
| Planetoid-T | 0.9445 | 0.8414 |
| SVM | 0.9451 | 0.8382 |
| HUG-FM | 0.9578 | 0.8681 |
| NORM-THR | 0.8673 | 0.8371 |
| OTSU | 0.8565 | 0.6720 |

Table 4: Water delineation performance of different methods on the Houston-large dataset.

tive variant of Planetoid, denoted as Planetoid-I. Figure 4 shows the performance of SEANO in inductive classification compared to other methods.

As described in Figure 4, SEANO performs the best amongst all the methods. The advantages of SEANO over other methods still hold in inductive learning and most of the observations made in this setting are consistent with those reported in Figure 2 and Figure 3. The results of this experiment demonstrate that even when the testing dataset is not observed, SEANO is still able to learn the embeddings reasonably well and moreover outperform the state-of-the-art.

# 4. RELATED WORK

**Semi-supervised Learning:** Semi-supervised learning uses unlabeled data in conjunction with some amount of labeled data to learn a classifier. This type of learning has become widely used in recent years [23, 39, 6]. A common approach within this genre is graph-based semi-supervised learning. This category of methods leverages graph structure in addition to labeled and unlabeled instances. In general, these methods use graph structure to add a regularizer to the loss function by assuming that nearby nodes in the graph should have similar labels. There are different variants of graph-based semi-supervised learning methods. These variants are distingiushed by the choice of the loss function and the specifics of the regularizer[5, 4]. Note that the graphs here can be provided either by explicit leveraging of domain knowledge [3] or by implicit construction from the original data using the nearest neighbor methods (e.g., $k$-NN) [7]. Additionally, semi-supervised learning methods can be categorized into transductive learning[16] and inductive learning[36] depending on whether the method can handle unseen data [41]. Within the SEANO framework, our goal is to learn the embeddings of an attributed network by leveraging label information. Our work can be viewed in some respects as a novel instantiation of semi-supervised learning; but note that it can be applied in both a transductive and inductive setting with applications to classification, clustering and outlier detection.

**Network Embedding:** Network embedding strategies have gained increasing importance in recent years. Early ideas in this space include IsoMap [35] and Locally Linear Embedding (LLE) [29]. Such ideas exploited the manifold structure on which vector data resides to compute a low-dimensional embedding of the original data. More recently, due to the emergence of naturally arising network data (e.g.

in social networks and biological networks), other network embedding methods have been proposed[34, 27, 13]. In addition to learning embeddings for homogeneous networks, recently several researchers have proposed ideas for embedding attributed or heterogeneous networks. Yang *et al.* introduce text-associated DeepWalk, integrating the text features of vertices into the network embedding using matrix factorization [37]. Huang *et al.* assumed all the labels of the vertices are provided and formulated embedding learning as an optimization problem in a way similar to graph regularizer [15]. Yang *et al.* proposed Planetoid for semi-supervised learning by introducing a graph embedding layer to their deep model [38]. Among these, Planetoid is the closest to our work. However, it is specialized for semi-supervised classification and the network embedding, as a byproduct, does not capture all information and cannot be generalized to other applications such as outlier detection. This can be seen from their network architecture where the embedding is simply concatenated (and not integrated) with vertex attribute information for predicting the vertex label. Moreover, they used two different models to separately support transductive and inductive learning. On the other hand, `SEANO` learns an integrated embedding directly encompassing attribute information and supports both transductive and inductive learning while explicitly accounting for outliers.

**Outlier Detection:** While there has been a plethora of work on outlier detection under different contexts [8, 19], outlier detection in network data has not been studied until recently [2]. Most previous methods in this space focused on the topological features of the graph to detect anomalous patterns, such as subgraph frequency [24], density [1], community structure [11], etc. More recent work in this area looks into the attributed network by incorporating the vertex attributes [28, 26]. Only a couple of recent works attempted to discover network outliers using a network embedding [10, 14]. Gao *et al.* used spectral embeddings to discover anomalous cluster structure across multi-source objects [10]. Hu *et al.* proposed a network embedding method to reveal the inconsistencies in local linkage structure and community structure [14]. Our work is somewhat orthogonal to these efforts although we leverage the notion of outliers explicitly in our `SEANO` framework.

# 5. CONCLUSIONS

We solve the problem of network embedding in PLANs. We propose a semi-supervised learning framework to learn embeddings that jointly preserve graph proximity, attribute affinity and label information. Our experiments on real-world data, along with an interesting case study, demonstrate the efficacy of our method over the state-of-the-art. In the future, we seek to improve the performance of the inductive variant of our framework to handle concept drift.

# 6. REFERENCES


[1] L. Akoglu, M. McGlohon, and C. Faloutsos. Oddball: Spotting anomalies in weighted graphs. In *PAKDD'10*, pages 410–421.

[2] L. Akoglu, H. Tong, and D. Koutra. Graph based anomaly detection and description: a survey. *DMKD'15*, 29(3):626–688.

[3] M.-F. t. Balcan. Person identification in webcam images: An application of semi-supervised learning.

[4] M. Belkin, P. Niyogi, and V. Sindhwani. Manifold regularization: A geometric framework for learning from labeled and unlabeled examples. *JMLR'06*, 7(Nov):2399–2434.

[5] A. Blum and S. Chawla. Learning from labeled and unlabeled data using graph mincuts. 2001.

[6] A. Blum and T. Mitchell. Combining labeled and unlabeled data with co-training. In *COLT'98*, pages 92–100. ACM.

[7] M. A. Carreira-Perpinán and R. S. Zemel. Proximity graphs for clustering and manifold learning. In *NIPS'04*, pages 225–232.

[8] V. Chandola, A. Banerjee, and V. Kumar. Anomaly detection: A survey. *CSUR'09*, 41(3):15.

[9] T. Cour, F. Benezit, and J. Shi. Spectral segmentation with multiscale graph decomposition. In *CVPR'05*.

[10] J. Gao, W. Fan, D. Turaga, S. Parthasarathy, and J. Han. A spectral framework for detecting inconsistency across multi-source object relationships. In *ICDM'11*.

[11] J. Gao and *et al.* On community outliers and their efficient detection in information networks. In *KDD'10*, pages 813–822.

[12] X. Glorot and Y. Bengio. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *AISTATS'10*.

[13] A. Grover and J. Leskovec. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *KDD'16*, pages 855–864.

[14] R. Hu, C. C. Aggarwal, S. Ma, and J. Huai. An embedding approach to anomaly detection. In *ICDE'16*, pages 385–396.

[15] X. Huang, J. Li, and X. Hu. Label informed attributed network embedding. In *WSDM'17*.

[16] T. Joachims. Transductive inference for text classification using support vector machines. In *ICML'99*, pages 200–209.

[17] T. M. Le and H. W. Lauw. Probabilistic latent document network embedding. In *ICDM'14*, pages 270–279, 2014.

[18] J. Liang, P. Jacobs, and S. Parthasararthy. Human-guided flood mapping on satellite images. In *IDEA'16*, 2016.

[19] J. Liang and S. Parthasarathy. Robust contextual outlier detection: Where context meets sparsity. In *CIKM'16*.

[20] F. T. Liu, K. M. Ting, and Z.-H. Zhou. Isolation forest. In *ICDM'08*, pages 413–422. IEEE.

[21] S. Martinis, A. Twele, and S. Voigt. Towards operational near real-time flood detection using a split-based automatic thresholding procedure on high resolution terrasar-x data. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences'09*, 9(2):303–314.

[22] T. Mikolov and *et al.* Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *NIPS'13*.

[23] K. Nigam and *et al.* Text classification from labeled and unlabeled documents using em. *Machine learning*, 39(2-3):103–134, 2000.

[24] C. C. Noble and D. J. Cook. Graph-based anomaly detection. In *KDD'03*, pages 631–636. ACM.

[25] N. Otsu. A threshold selection method from gray-level histograms. *Automatica'75*, 11(285-296):23–27.

[26] B. Perozzi and L. Akoglu. Scalable anomaly ranking of attributed neighborhoods. In *SDM'16*, pages 207–215.

[27] B. Perozzi, R. Al-Rfou, and S. Skiena. Deepwalk: Online learning of social representations. In *KDD'14*, pages 701–710.

[28] B. Perozzi and *et al.* Focused clustering and outlier detection in large attributed graphs. In *KDD'14*.

[29] S. T. Roweis and L. K. Saul. Nonlinear dimensionality reduction by locally linear embedding. *Science*, 2000.

[30] D. E. Rumelhart and *et al.* Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Cognitive modeling'88*.

[31] P. Sen and *et al.* Collective classification in network data. *AI magazine'08*, 29(3):93.

[32] X. Song, M. Wu, C. Jermaine, and S. Ranka. Conditional anomaly detection. *TKDE*, 2007.

[33] J. A. Suykens and J. Vandewalle. Least squares support vector machine classifiers. *Neural processing letters'99*, 9(3):293–300.

[34] J. Tang, M. Qu, M. Wang, M. Zhang, J. Yan, and Q. Mei. Line: Large-scale information network embedding. In *WWW'15*.

[35] J. B. Tenenbaum and *et al.* A global geometric framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction. *Science*, 2000.

[36] J. Weston and *et al.* Deep learning via semi-supervised embedding. In *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade*, pages 639–655. Springer, 2012.

[37] C. Yang, Z. Liu, D. Zhao, M. Sun, and E. Y. Chang. Network representation learning with rich text information. In *IJCAI'15*, pages 2111–2117.

[38] Z. Yang, W. Cohen, and R. Salakhutdinov. Revisiting semi-supervised learning with graph embeddings. *ICML'16*.

[39] D. Yarowsky. Unsupervised word sense disambiguation rivaling supervised methods. In *ACL'95*.

[40] S. Zhu, K. Yu, Y. Chi, and Y. Gong. Combining content and link for classification using matrix factorization. In *SIGIR'07*.

[41] X. Zhu and *et al.* Semi-supervised learning using gaussian fields and harmonic functions. In *ICML'03*, volume 3, pages 912–919.